

WATER QUALITY M E M O R A N D U M

Utah Coal Regulatory Program

October 9, 2003

TO: Internal File

THRU: Daron R. Haddock, Permit Supervisor

FROM: Dana Dean, P.E., Senior Reclamation Hydrologist

RE: 2000 First Quarter Water Monitoring, Plateau Mining Corporation, Willow Creek Mine, C/007/0038-WQ00-1, Task ID #846

- 1. Was data submitted for all of the MRP required sites?** YES ☐ NO ☒
Identify sites not monitored and reason why, if known:

The Permittee did not submit required samples for sites B211 (March), B331, B331A, B51, B121, BN251, or BN301. They reported "No Access" at sites B131, B151, B211 (Feb.), B26, B263, B353, and B25.

- 2. On what date does the MRP require a five-year resampling of baseline water data.**
See Technical Directive 004 for baseline resampling requirements. Consider the five-year baseline resubmittal when responding to question one above. Indicate if the MRP does not have such a requirement.

Resampling due date

The MRP has a commitment to resample for baseline parameters in 2000 (the year prior to permit renewal).

- 3. Were all required parameters reported for each site?** YES ☐ NO ☒
Comments, including identity of monitoring site:

All lab samples were missing lab pH, lab conductivity, dissolved selenium, and nitrate. Site BN221 was also missing dissolved oxygen. The February sample for site B3N was missing flow information.

4. Were irregularities found in the data?

YES ☒ NO ☐

Comments, including identity of monitoring site:

Dissolved chloride at Site B5 (34 mg/l) was 2.18 standard deviations from the mean of 17.17 mg/l. At site B6, dissolved chloride (35 mg/l) was 2.30 standard deviations from the mean of 17.49 mg/l. Total dissolved solids at site BN221 (412 mg/l) were 3.68 standard deviations from the mean of 334.25 mg/l.

The cation-anion balance was greater than 5% at five sites. They were B3N (6.0%), B5 (8.7%), B6 (8.8%), B151 (6.4%), BN221 (5.3%).

5. Were DMR forms submitted for all required sites?

1 st month,	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>
2 nd month,	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>
3 rd month,	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>

6. Were all required DMR parameters reported?

YES ☒ NO ☐

Comments, including identity of monitoring site:

All DMR's reported "No Flow."

7. Were irregularities found in the DMR data?

YES ☐ NO ☒

Comments, including identity of monitoring site:

All DMR's reported "No Flow."

8. Based on your review, what further actions, if any, do you recommend?

No further actions are necessary at this time. The missing samples were most likely submitted and/or reviewed during complete inspections at the time, however they did not get into the database or the Division's files. Due to the lapse of time, and personnel and other changes at the mine, the Permittee is unable to locate the missing data now. If the Permittee locates the data, they will submit it to the database.